



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/761,977	01/17/2001	John Barile	1280.00278	5743

7590

10/27/2003

David E Bennett
Coats & Bennett
1400 Crescent Green
Suite 300
Cary, NC 27511

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/761,977

Applicant(s)

BARILE, JOHN

Examin r

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 January 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35-U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because fig. 4 has a depiction of an arrow with missing reference number. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 6 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kohda (US 5,675,374).

As per claim 1, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants, comprising a display, a receiver receiving audio and video signals from a plurality of the remote participants (Abstract), a comparator comparing the received audio signals from the remote participants and a controller controlling the display to display a video image extracted from the video signals based on the comparison of the received audio signals (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *a comparator detects audio*

Art Unit: 2174

signals and an image determination means controls the display and displays a video image extracted from the video signals based on the comparison of the received audio signals).

As per claim 2, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the comparator selects an active participant from the remote participants (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *wherein active participants are selected from the remote participants*).

As per claims 3 and 14, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the comparator selects as the active participant the remote participant from which the strongest audio signal is received (col. 10, lines 1-7; col. 11, lines 9-31; *the comparator selects the active participant, the speaking participant, with the strongest audio signal*).

As per claim 4, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the comparator compares the audio signals over a selected period of time (col. 17, lines 12-17).

As per claims 6 and 13, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *e.g. if two out of three participants are actively speaking, the two actively speaking will be displayed while the third will not be displayed*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Palmer et al. ("Palmer", US 5,594,859).

As per claim 5, although Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to distinguish all but one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *e.g. if two out of three participants are actively speaking, the two actively speaking will be displayed while the third will not be displayed*), Kohda does not explicitly disclose the distinguishing feature to be one wherein the controller freezes all but one of the video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator. Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to freeze all but one of the video image of one remote participant based on user's selective comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants (col. 9, lines 19-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Palmer's method to selectively freeze all but one extracted video image of one remote participant based on a comparison of the received audio signals from remote participants in a

Art Unit: 2174

video conferencing system to Kohda's method of selectively distinguish all but one extracted video image of one remote participant based on a comparison of the received audio signals from remote participants based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator in a video conferencing system in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

6. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Palmer et al. ("Palmer", US 5,594,859).

As per claim 7, although Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *e.g. if two out of three participants are actively speaking, the two actively speaking will be displayed while the third will not be displayed*), Kohda does not explicitly disclose the highlighting feature to be one wherein the controller displays the one video image in an area larger than the area in which each other video image is displayed. Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image in an area larger than the area in which each other video image is displayed (fig. 18; col. 21, lines 5-6; *video image 524 of fig. 18 may be "sized"*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Palmer's method wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying the one video image in an area larger than the area in which each other video image is displayed in a video conferencing system to Kohda's method wherein

Art Unit: 2174

the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

As per claim 8, the modified Kohda and Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to display only the one video image (Palmer: fig. 26(a)).

As per claim 9, the modified Kohda and Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to display other than the one video image in areas smaller than the area in which the one video image is displayed (Palmer: fig. 18; col. 21, lines 5-6; *video image 524 of fig. 18 may be "sized"*).

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Palmer et al. ("Palmer", US 5,594,859).

As per claim 12, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *e.g. if two out of three participants are actively speaking, the two actively speaking will be displayed while the third will not be displayed*), Kohda does not explicitly disclose the highlighting feature to be one wherein the controller displays video images other than the one video image using a color scheme different than the color scheme used to display the one video image. Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying video images other than the one video image using a color scheme different than the

Art Unit: 2174

color scheme used to display the one video image (figs. 2 and 26(b-g); *e.g. control of color hue, color saturation, brightness, contrast*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Palmer's method wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying video images other than the one video image using a color scheme different than the color scheme used to display the one video image to Kohda's method wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365).

As per claim 10, although Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31), Kohda does not explicitly disclose the highlighting to be in the form of a distinctive border around the one video image. Tang teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight the one video image by displaying a distinctive border around the one video image (fig. 1A; col. 7, lines 36-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Tang's distinctive border as a form of highlighting to Kohda's method of

Art Unit: 2174

highlighting in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365).

As per claim 11, although Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31), Kohda does not explicitly disclose the highlighting to be in the form of displaying alphanumeric identification regarding the one remote participant. Tang teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying alphanumeric identification regarding the one remote participant (col. 9, lines 29-33; figs. 1B, 3, 5 and 8; *e.g.* "*Trevor Morris x63097...*", "*Trev*", "*Ellen, Rick*", *etc.*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Tang's teaching of a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying alphanumeric identification regarding the one remote participant to Kohda's teaching of a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

Art Unit: 2174

10. Claims 15-18, 20, 27-28, 30, 31-35, 43-44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Ludwig et al. ("Ludwig", US 6,212,547 B1).

As per claim 15, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants, comprising a display, a receiver receiving audio and video signals from a plurality of the remote participants (Abstract), a comparator comparing the received audio signals from the remote participants and a controller controlling the display to display a video image extracted from the video signals based on the comparison of the received audio signals (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *a comparator detects audio signals and an image determination means controls the display and displays a video image extracted from the video signals based on the comparison of the received audio signals*). Kohda does not explicitly disclose the communication terminal to be a mobile terminal. Ludwig teaches a mobile terminal for video conferencing (col. 18, lines 17-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ludwig's mobile terminal for video conferencing to Kohda's communication terminal for video conferencing in order to provide users with a portable system and a system with greater accessibility.

As per claim 16, the modified Kohda and Ludwig teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the comparator selects an active participant from the remote participants (Kohda: figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *wherein active participants are selected from the remote participants*).

As per claim 17, the modified Kohda and Ludwig teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the comparator selects as the active

Art Unit: 2174

participant the remote participant from which the strongest audio signal is received (Kohda: col. 10, lines 1-7; col. 11, lines 9-31; *the comparator selects the active participant, the speaking participant, with the strongest audio signal*).

As per claim 18, the modified Kohda and Ludwig teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the comparator compares the audio signals over a selected period of time (Kohda: col. 17, lines 12-17).

As per claim 20, the modified Kohda and Ludwig teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (Kohda: figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *e.g. if two out of three participants are actively speaking, the two actively speaking will be displayed while the third will not be displayed*).

Claim 31 is similar in scope to claim 15 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 32 is similar in scope to claim 16 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 33 and 44 are individually similar in scope to claim 17 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 34 is similar in scope to claim 18 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 35 and 43 are individually similar in scope to claim 20 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 30 and 46 are individually similar in scope to claim 15 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale, with the exception of the one video image and another video image displayed on the right side and the left side respectively as well as outputting the audio signal

Art Unit: 2174

associated with the one video signal and the other video signal to a right speaker and left speaker respectively, which Kohda also teaches (col. 11, line 34 through col. 10, line 7; *right versus left video and acoustic means*).

As per claim 28, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the comparator selects as the active participant the remote participant from which the strongest audio signal is received (col. 10, lines 1-7; col. 11, lines 9-31; *the comparator selects the active participant, the speaking participant, with the strongest audio signal*).

As per claim 27, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *e.g. if two out of three participants are actively speaking, the two actively speaking will be displayed while the third will not be displayed*).

11. Claims 19 and 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Ludwig et al. ("Ludwig", US 6,212,547 B1) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Palmer et al. ("Palmer", US 5,594,859).

As per claim 19, although the modified Kohda and Ludwig teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to distinguish all but one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (Kohda: figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *e.g. if two out of three*

participants are actively speaking, the two actively speaking will be displayed while the third will not be displayed), the modified Kohda and Ludwig does not explicitly disclose the distinguishing feature to be one wherein the controller freezes all but one of the video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator. Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to freeze all but one of the video image of one remote participant based on user's selective comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants (col. 9, lines 19-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Palmer's method to selectively freeze all but one extracted video image of one remote participant based on a comparison of the received audio signals from remote participants in a video conferencing system to the modified Kohda and Ludwig's method of selectively distinguish all but one extracted video image of one remote participant based on a comparison of the received audio signals from remote participants based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator in a video conferencing system in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

Claim 41 is similar in scope to claim 19 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

12. Claims 21-23 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Ludwig et al. ("Ludwig", US 6,212,547 B1) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Palmer et al. ("Palmer", US 5,594,859).

As per claim 21, although the modified Kohda and Ludwig teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the

Art Unit: 2174

display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (Kohda: figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *e.g. if two out of three participants are actively speaking, the two actively speaking will be displayed while the third will not be displayed*), the modified Kohda and Ludwig does not explicitly disclose the highlighting feature to be one wherein the controller displays the one video image in an area larger than the area in which each other video image is displayed. Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image in an area larger than the area in which each other video image is displayed (fig. 18; col. 21, lines 5-6; *video image 524 of fig. 18 may be "sized"*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Palmer's method wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying the one video image in an area larger than the area in which each other video image is displayed in a video conferencing system to the modified Kohda and Ludwig's method wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

As per claim 22, the modified Kohda, Ludwig and Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to display only the one video image (Palmer: fig. 26(a)).

As per claim 23, the modified Kohda, Ludwig and Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the

Art Unit: 2174

display to display other than the one video image in areas smaller than the area in which the one video image is displayed (Palmer: fig. 18; col. 21, lines 5-6; *video image 524 of fig. 18 may be "sized"*).

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 21 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 37 is similar in scope to claim 22 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 38 is similar in scope to claim 23 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

13. Claims 24 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Ludwig et al. ("Ludwig", US 6,212,547 B1) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365).

As per claim 24, although the modified Kohda and Ludwig teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (Kohda: figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31), the modified Kohda and Ludwig does not explicitly disclose the highlighting to be in the form of a distinctive border around the one video image. Tang teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight the one video image by displaying a distinctive border around the one video image (fig. 1A; col. 7, lines 36-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Tang's distinctive border as a form of highlighting to the modified Kohda and Ludwig's method of highlighting in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 39 is similar in scope to claim 24 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

14. Claims 25 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Ludwig et al. ("Ludwig", US 6,212,547 B1) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365).

As per claim 25, although the modified Kohda and Ludwig teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (Kohda: figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31), the modified Kohda and Ludwig does not explicitly disclose the highlighting to be in the form of displaying alphanumeric identification regarding the one remote participant. Tang teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying alphanumeric identification regarding the one remote participant (col. 9, lines 29-33; figs. 1B, 3, 5 and 8; *e.g.* "Trevor Morris x63097...", "Trev", "Ellen, Rick", *etc.*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Tang's teaching of a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying alphanumeric identification regarding the one remote participant to the modified Kohda and Ludwig's teaching of a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the

Art Unit: 2174

received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

Claim 40 is similar in scope to claim 25 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

15. Claims 26 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Ludwig et al. ("Ludwig", US 6,212,547 B1) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Palmer et al. ("Palmer", US 5,594,859).

As per claim 26, the modified Kohda and Ludwig teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator (Kohda: figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *e.g. if two out of three participants are actively speaking, the two actively speaking will be displayed while the third will not be displayed*), the modified Kohda and Ludwig does not explicitly disclose the highlighting feature to be one wherein the controller displays video images other than the one video image using a color scheme different than the color scheme used to display the one video image. Palmer teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying video images other than the one video image using a color scheme different than the color scheme used to display the one video image (figs. 2 and 26(b-g); *e.g. control of color hue, color saturation, brightness, contrast*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Palmer's method wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image by displaying video images other than the one video image using a color scheme

Art Unit: 2174

different than the color scheme used to display the one video image to the modified Kohda and Ludwig's method wherein the controller controls the display to highlight one extracted video image of one remote participant based on the comparison of the received audio signals from the remote participants by the comparator in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

Claim 42 is similar in scope to claim 26 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

16. Claims 29 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda (US 5,675,374) in view of Ludwig et al. ("Ludwig", US 6,212,547 B1), and further in view of Palmer et al. ("Palmer", US 5,594,859).

As per claim 29, Kohda teaches a communication terminal for video conferencing with remote participants, comprising a display, a receiver receiving audio and video signals from a plurality of the remote participants (Abstract), a comparator comparing the received audio signals from the remote participants and a controller controlling the display to display a video image extracted from the video signals based on the comparison of the received audio signals (figs. 4-5; col. 6, lines 44-46; col. 7, lines 3-38; col. 11, lines 9-31; *a comparator detects audio signals and an image determination means controls the display and displays a video image extracted from the video signals based on the comparison of the received audio signals*). Kohda does not explicitly disclose the communication terminal to be a mobile terminal. Ludwig teaches a mobile terminal for video conferencing (col. 18, lines 17-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ludwig's mobile terminal for video conferencing to Kohda's communication terminal for video conferencing in order to provide users with a portable system and a system with greater accessibility. However, the modified

Art Unit: 2174

Khoda and Ludwig does not explicitly disclose a display having a height greater than its width, the display operating in a portrait mode in a default condition and a controller controlling the display to display video images extracted from the video signals in a landscape mode when the wireless receiver receives the video signals from a plurality of the remote participants. Palmer teaches a a display having a height greater than its width, the display operating in a portrait mode in a default condition and a controller controlling the display to display video images extracted from the video signals in a landscape mode when the wireless receiver receives the video signals from a plurality of the remote participants (fig. 18; col. 21, lines 5-6; *video image 524 of fig. 18 may be "sized"*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Palmer's method of sizing a display in a video conferencing system to the modified Khoda and Ludwigs method of a video conferencing system in order to provide a participant more control as to how the video images of other participants are viewed.

As per claim 29, Khoda teaches a method of

Claim 45 is similar in scope to claim 29 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Baumgartner et al. (US 5,195,086) teach multiple call control method in a multimedia conferencing system.

Fernandes (US 6,014,135) teaches collaboration centric document processing environment.

Art Unit: 2174

Inquires

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lê Nguyen
Patent Examiner
October 18, 2003


KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100